HN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,828	06/29/2001	Scott D. Guthrie	003797.00147	3720

27488	7590	01/12/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
HO, ANDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary		09/894,828	GUTHRIE ET AL.
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	
		The Thanh Ho	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with th correspondence address --

Peri d for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 October 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachm nt(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 10/4/2004.

2. Claims 1-32 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gosling U.S Patent No. 6,247,044 in view of Logston U.S Patent No. 6,687,735.

As to claim 11, Gosling teaches a method for processing (a request for

information from a client computer to a server computer, lines 62-64 column 3) HTTP

request (Hypertext Transfer Protocol "HTTP", lines 3-4 column 4) comprising:

forming a context object (servlet object, line 67 column 1) that logically

represents an HTTP request (specified servlet object corresponding to the request, line

67 column 1 to line 1 column 2) that is received at a host application (web server, line

65 column 2) from a client application (client browser, line 54 column 2), the context

object encapsulating at least one property associated with the received request (maps

the request to a servlet name; the servlet may be specified by a URL, in which case the

mapping process is direct; some translation process may be required to identify which

servlet will be able to service the request; specify that some kinds of client requests always map to a particular servlet, lines 46-55 column 4);

forming an event pipeline corresponding to the context object (invoking a servlet so that it generates the requested dynamic information, lines 42-43 column 5), the event pipeline having a plurality of request events (HttpRequest, line 15 column 7; accepting requests, line 29 column 7), each request event having a corresponding event (HttpResponse, line 15 column 7; generating responses, line 29 column 7). Gosling does not explicitly teach generating a callback and initiating the module.

Logston teaches a system of communication between processes (DASP process and load balancing process, lines 10-14 column 33) wherein generating a call-back when the event corresponding to the request event is raised (the DASP registers for these events by calling a registration method and passes it the callback method or object; when the runtime environment encounters one of the events that the DASP has registered for, it will call the method or object given during registration; the callback method is called when the event occurs, lines 29-35 column 33); and when a module is registered in association with the request event (the method or object given during registration, lines 33-34 column 33); initializing the module in response to the callback (call the method or object, line 33 column 33). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Logston to the system of Gosling because this allows the client process to be notified whenever a registered event has been processed; therefore the client process could send subsequent events or finish the processing of the process.

As to claim 12, Logston further teaches registering a module in association with a selected request event (registers to receive runtime environment system events include a statistics request, a shutdown request, a state request, an add client request, and the like, lines 10-13 column 33; the method or object given during registration, lines 33-34 column 33).

As to claim 13, Logston further teaches registering a plurality of modules in association with a selected request event (register for events with methods and objects given during registration, lines 10-11 and 33-34 column 33).

As to claim 14, Gosling as modified further teaches the request events have a deterministic order (GET, POST, HEAD, lines 39 column 9).

As to claim 15, Gosling as modified further teaches one request event is a synchronous event (POST, line 39 column 9).

As to claim 16, Gosling as modified further teaches one request event is an asynchronous event (the process is waited as the request is being directed by the servlet to other locations, lines 36-39 column 9).

As to claim 17, Gosling as modified further teaches one request event having a non-deterministic order (errors, line 47 column 7; HTTP-specific error messages, line 41 column 9).

As to claim 18, Gosling as modified further teaches the plurality of request events having a non-deterministic order (errors, line 47 column 7; HTTP-specific error messages, line 41 column 9).

As t   claim 19, Gosling as modified further teaches the plurality of non-

deterministic order request events include an error event (errors, line 47 column 7;

HTTP-specific error messages, line 41 column 9).

As to claim 20, Gosling as modified further teaches forming the event pipeline

as a separate instance for each HTTP request (specify that some kinds of client

requests always map to a particular servlet, lines 53-55 column 4).

As to claim 21, Gosling as modified further teaches parsing the request to form

the context object (maps the request to a servlet name, lines 46-47 column 4).

As to claims 1-7, they are system claims of claims 11 and 14-19, respectively.

Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 11 and 14-19 above.

As to claims 8-10, they are system claims of claims 12 and 20-21, respectively.

Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 12 and 20-21 above.

As to claims 22-32, they are computer product claims of claims 11-21,

respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 11-21 above.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/4/2004 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Gosling does not teach forming an event pipeline

corresponding to the context object (Remarks, first three paragraphs page 8). In

response, as disclosed in the claim rejection above, it is pointed out that a servlet object

is served as a context object that logically represents an HTTP request (specified

servlet object corresponding to the request, line 67 column 1 to line 1 column 2).

Therefore, one particular servlet is being used for a specific request. Regarding the

applicant's argument about forming an event pipeline, Gosling teaches that after the

communication is established between the client request and the servlet object,

subsequent requests from the client and subsequent responses from the servlet create

an event pipeline (lines 14-67 column 7; lines 45-59 column 9). The reference meets

the limitation as claimed.

Applicant argued that Logston does not teach an event pipeline corresponding to

the context object (Remarks, last paragraph page 8 continue to page 9). In response,

Logston was not used to teach this limitation.

Applicant argued that Gosling does not teach an event pipeline having request

events and request event having a corresponding to event (Remarks, last three

paragraphs page 9 continue to page 10). In response, as responded in the argument

above, Gosling teaches that after the communication is established between the client

request and the servlet object, subsequent requests from the client and subsequent

responses from the servlet create an event pipeline (lines 14-67 column 7; lines 45-59

column 9). Applicant further argued that the servlet is not an event pipeline. Again, as

discussed above, a servlet object is served as a context object, not an event pipeline.

Applicant argued that Logston does not teach generating and initiating (Remarks,

last paragraph page 10 continue to pages 11-12). In response, as discussed in the

claim rejection above, Logston teaches a concept of generating a call back when an

event is raised and initiating a software module to process. Regarding the arguments

about event pipeline and context object, Logston was not used to teach these limitations.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to The Thanh Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.

- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.

- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 – 3762

TTH
January 6, 2005

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100